

We went out the back corridor and down the steps. As you go down the steps, there is a window that looks out on the sidewalk near the Capitol Building, and I saw this mob coming at us with Trump flags and American flags and signs—coming right at us. We hurried down those steps and through the long tunnel to, we hoped, a safe location in one of the office buildings nearby.

I will never forget it. Do the 45 Senators who voted against the impeachment trial last night still remember it? I certainly hope they do, and I certainly hope they can recall it as they watch the videotapes, the mountain of videotapes of what happened that day.

And, of course, I hope we all remember what the Capitol Police went through. For those who say they love law and order, take a look at what they went through when this mob came after them. They were beaten. One gave his life. And we can never forget.

So how did this come about? Was this just a spontaneous gathering of people who decided to come to Capitol Hill? Far from it. The President of the United States, Donald Trump, requested his followers to come to Washington on January 6. Why did he pick January 6? Because the Constitution says that is the day when Congress will count the electoral votes and determine who will be the next President.

And because President Trump refused to accept the reality of his loss on November 3 and continued in every imaginable way to try to change the numbers coming out of States like Georgia, he called his followers to Washington on that day and held a rally on the Ellipse.

We have a tape of that rally, and it should be part of the record as to what this President said to his followers who had gathered on that day, how his rhetoric inflamed them. We can see it. It is a matter of record.

Then he pointed to the Capitol Building, this building, and told them to come up here. Why? Because we were in the process of counting the electoral votes, which would finally and constitutionally announce that he had lost the election. It was his last desperate gasp to keep the White House, even at the expense of the Constitution and reality.

Then the crowd turned and advanced on the Capitol. We have seen those videotapes as well, as they overran the flimsy barricades that were set up in the hopes that they would discourage and stop them. And they broke through windows and doors, came into this building, invading it for the first time since 1814.

It was 1814 when the British forces came into this building, burned it, as an invasion. Well, this was a new invasion, an invasion by those who were either inspired by this President or, for whatever political reasons, decided to try to stop this government.

It is the first time that has ever happened since 1814. I will never forget it.

I am sorry to say that the 45 Senators who said stop the investigation, stop the impeachment, may not have as clear a memory as I do.

Each year, we have a commemoration of George Washington's Farewell Address, and a different Member of the Senate is asked to read it on the floor of the Senate. I have to tell you that, honestly, I don't come to the floor and listen carefully. It doesn't have the impact it once had. It is a commemoration which is honorific but doesn't have the real power to create a memory.

Doug Jones is a former Senator from Alabama, and he said on Martin Luther King's birthday, or nearby, we should all come to the floor and hear a reading of King's letter from the Birmingham jail, and I think that is appropriate and it is good.

How will we remember and commemorate January 6? Maybe it is too soon to think about that, but how can we forget what happened that day? How can we possibly get over it?

I don't want to get over it. I want to face it squarely and honestly with the facts. History demands it of us. Those of us who are honored to serve in this Chamber bear a responsibility to keep the facts alive, not let those who wish to ignore them or rewrite history have the last word.

We now have a responsibility to go forward with this impeachment trial, to make a record and decide as a U.S. Senate. We owe it to the people we represent. That is for sure. But, more importantly, we owe it to future generations to show them just how fragile a democracy can be when a mob turns on the U.S. Capitol and tries to stop the business of this government.

The good news is this. If there is any source of elation, it is this: We returned to the Capitol that same day, January 6, and finished our business of counting the electoral vote. In the early hours of the morning of January 7, Joseph Biden was announced the winner of the Presidency, and just 2 weeks later—2 weeks later to the day—he was sworn in as President of the United States.

Our democracy survived this mob that came forward in insurrection against our government, and we are now in the beginning of the second week of the Biden Presidency. He has spoken to the American people and told them we are going to come together; we are going to unify. Bless him for doing that.

We owe him this opportunity. We owe it to our country.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ROE V. WADE

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, last Friday, we observed the 48th anniversary of Roe v. Wade—the Supreme Court decision that legalized abortion through all 9 months of pregnancy. It is a somber day every year, as we contemplate the millions of lives lost to abortion since the Roe v. Wade decision.

Gallup has been polling on abortion for decades, and if you look at the polling on the issue, one thing becomes clear: The majority of Americans do not believe in unrestricted abortion. Some believe that abortion should be completely illegal. Some believe abortion should be legal under certain circumstances. But the majority of Americans do not believe in unrestricted abortion.

Why is that? Why, despite the best efforts of the far left, do the majority of Americans think there should be at least some restrictions on abortion? I suspect the answer is that every person knows on some level that when we are talking about abortion, we are talking about a baby, a human being. It is not rocket science; it is biology 101. Human moms and dads have human babies. Take one look at an ultrasound, at a baby girl sucking her thumb or a baby boy kicking his feet, and it is pretty hard to argue that is just a clump of cells.

I believe that is why, despite years of fierce abortion advocacy from the far left, the majority of Americans do not believe in unrestricted abortion, because they know—they know—the unborn child is a human being, and they know a human being deserves to be protected even when they are small and weak and vulnerable—especially when they are small and weak and vulnerable.

The truth is, advocates of abortion are fighting an uphill battle. It doesn't always feel like that. After all, they have a lot of support from the entertainment industry and magazines and media outlets and Democratic politicians. The pro-abortion left has a lot of money. They have won too many victories, and too many babies have been killed. But despite their money and platform and advantage, in 48 years, advocates for abortion have not won their fight. They have not managed to convince anywhere close to a majority of Americans that abortion is an unqualified good and should be available unrestricted and on demand, and that is because, for all their advantages, they are fighting an unwinnable battle because they are fighting against reality, they are fighting against truth, they are fighting against science, and they are fighting against the knowledge that is written on every human heart, a truth that gets obscured but is hard to completely erase, and that is, every human being has value and deserves to be protected.

Last week, I came down to the floor to praise President Biden's call for unity, and I suggested that one way he could show that commitment was by

nominating individuals for key posts who represent a majority of Americans instead of the far-left wing of his party. I think several of the President's nominations have demonstrated his commitment to unity. While perhaps not the people I would have chosen, I believe that a number of his nominees will serve Americans well, and I have voted accordingly, casting votes in favor of President Biden's choice for Director of National Intelligence and Secretary of Defense, among others.

But unfortunately President Biden has also nominated some individuals who represent the extreme left of the Democratic Party rather than mainstream Americans, and nowhere is that more true than with his radically pro-abortion nominee for Secretary of Health and Human Services.

As a Member of the House of Representatives, Javier Becerra accumulated an overwhelmingly pro-abortion voting record, even opposing a ban on partial-birth abortion—a procedure so heinous and repulsive, it is difficult even to describe. As attorney general of California, he used his position to advance the pro-abortion cause.

On top of that, he has shown a disturbing tendency to use his position to attack freedom of religion and freedom of conscience. As California attorney general, he sued an order of nuns who care for the elderly poor to try to force them to offer health insurance benefits that violate their faith. That is right—he thought it a good use of his time as attorney general to sue an order of nuns who care for the elderly poor. He also enthusiastically sought to enforce a California law that forced crisis pregnancy centers to advertise abortion services. The case went all the way to the Supreme Court, which overturned the California law because it violated the free speech protection of the First Amendment.

It is bad to support evils like abortion. It is worse to not only support an evil but to attempt to force others to participate in it in violation of their consciences.

I know the President is a man of faith, which makes it particularly perplexing why he would choose to nominate an individual who has used his position to attack freedom of religion and freedom of conscience. As head of the Department of Health and Human Services, Mr. Becerra would have the ability to not only push an extremist abortion agenda but to roll back important progress made to protect individuals' conscience rights. I am disappointed by the President's choice. Javier Becerra's pro-abortion views do not represent the views of the majority of Americans.

I am also very disappointed by the announcement that President Biden will overturn the Mexico City policy, which protects taxpayer dollars from being used to finance abortion in other countries. This is not a unifying action. Americans were not clamoring to have their tax dollars start supporting

abortions abroad. This is only a priority for the pro-abortion lobby.

As I said, I am disappointed in the President's actions, and going forward, I hope he will not let his Presidency be hijacked by abortion extremists. But whatever policies this administration pursues, I and many of my colleagues will continue to work to promote a culture of life in this country. The arc—the arc—of the moral universe is long, but I believe it does bend towards justice. I look forward to the day that we will secure justice for unborn human beings by ensuring that they are protected.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

IMMIGRATION

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. President, as we move through what is appearing to be a choppy start to the 117th Congress, I think it is worth reminding ourselves of the standards that guide our work here. The mandate that we have does not come from the 24-hour news cycle or from lobbyists or advocacy groups, but it comes, very simply, from the Constitution. It is the foundation of the rule of law, our Nation's Constitution, and it really serves as a pretty good policymaking guideline.

The American people are looking at what is going on here, and they see the cracks that Washington has made in the foundation of this Constitution. These realizations have eroded their confidence in our ability as a body to perform the basic functions of government without devolving into partisan chaos when faced with disagreements.

Many times I will hear Tennesseans say: What happened to robust political debate? What happened to being able to agreeably disagree and have a discussion? Are those days totally lost, or can we return to them? They are asking themselves how many shortcuts—like Executive orders—Washington is going to take before the shortcut becomes the rule or the norm and how many times can Washington chip away at the standards that govern our country before those standards start to crumble or are not relevant.

Restoring the trust of the American people will not be easy because this fundamental lack of faith in our institutions has caused Americans to question their very safety and security in the physical space and also in the virtual world that they have been forced into by the COVID-19 pandemic.

I like to say we have a lot of security moms who are out there—moms and grandmoms like me—and, quite frankly, they are out in full force, alongside

millions of other Americans who now have cause to wonder if their own government will bother making their security a priority. What about their communities? What about their neighborhoods? What about the universities where their children go to school? What is going to be done about riots? What about the virtual space? As they have seen their children move to online school, more of their daily functional life and their transactional life has moved online. How do they keep their families safe? How do they protect their rights to privacy?

In the physical space, yesterday we got the good news that a Federal judge has granted a temporary restraining order barring the Department of Homeland Security from implementing a nationwide pause on most deportations. That pause was mandated by a DHS memo signed by the Acting Secretary on day one of the Biden administration—not such a great start for the administration's immigration policy team, but the American people will benefit from having the time that has come to them to ask questions about proposed shifts in existing policy. People want to be safe.

I would like to just stipulate for the record that immigration law is very complex. While most Americans aren't experts in the finer points of immigration law, they do have and most of us have a very common touchstone that we relate to; that is, having a secure border.

This should be a basic concept—let's secure the border; let's secure our country—but somehow we have managed to politicize that point that advocates at the highest levels of the Federal Government—for what? A weakened border. Just imagine that. You have individuals at the highest level of the Federal Government who are saying: Let's weaken our border. That is stunning, absolutely stunning to Tennesseans.

Why would you not protect your border? Why would you not want to know who is coming into your country? Why should I be forced to accept a lax border? Why should I be accepting of allowing drug cartels to run those drugs into the country? Why should I be told I should accept human trafficking; I should accept gangs; I should accept sex traffickers coming in across the border?

When we have a weak border, this is what you get. Every town—every town—becomes a border town. Every State becomes a border State because of the impacts—the negative impacts—of drug trafficking, sex trafficking, human trafficking, and the toll that that takes on our communities.

Last week, I introduced two key pieces of legislation that attack specific vulnerabilities in our body of immigration law that thousands of bad actors use to game the system every year.

The first is the Stop Greenlighting Driver Licenses for Illegal Immigrants